

# **FGDC Address Subcommittee**

**April 14, 2020**

**11:00 pm – 12:30 pm Eastern**



# Meeting Agenda


---

1. **Welcome and Introductions/Roll Call – 5 min**
2. **NAD Updates – Jason Ford, Steve Lewis – 15 min**
3. **Puerto Rico Civic Address Vulnerability Evaluation (PRCAVE) Update – Raul Rios-Diaz – 15 min**
4. **NAD Content Recommendations – Final Discussion on NSGIC NAD Content Position – 45 min**
5. **Action Item Review – Dave Cackowski – 10 min**
6. **Adjourn**

---


# NAD Updates

# Partners



Whole state or local participation from 33 states

# Status by State/Locality



# Additions / Updates

**Kansas (NEW):** +1,028,112 over 86 of 105 counties participating

**Arizona:** (417,563)

**District of Columbia:** + 46,016

**Iowa:** + 375,281

**Awaiting processing for Release 6:** IN, NY, CO – Grand County, and CA – Merced County

# Notes

- Many thanks to Ken Nelson in Kansas!
- The updates from Indiana and Iowa were the first in 3+ years.
- Grand County Colorado did not participate in the statewide rollup, instead submitting directly to DOT.
- Merced County California reached out yesterday through the DOT NAD website and will be uploading their data today.
- The Dot Lake Tribe of native Alaskans also reached out through the DOT NAD website. They have been provided the schema and GDB template and introduced to the Alaska GIO.
- Release 6 will be published in early May.

---

# Puerto Rico Civic Address Vulnerability Evaluation (PRCAVE) Update

---

# NAD Content Recommendations Final Discussion on NSGIC NAD Content Position

# NSGIC Response

---

*There is one paragraph in the written comments from the content subgroup that serves quite well to focus our response. “The NAD Content Recommendation quite deliberately concerns content only. The recommendations say nothing about specific database design, table design, degree of normalization, etc. We submit that design recommendations would be premature until the NAD workflows and output products are better defined.” As we have previously described, our primary concern is not with the content recommendation itself but with the implication that the FGDC standard would be used as the native form for the NAD itself. As such, our concern is indeed about the specific database design. Given that the content subgroup is refraining from conclusions about database design until a point in the future, we agree that our issue is premature and don’t wish to prolong the current discussion by continuing to raise it now. However, in the context of its ongoing work pertaining to the National Address Database, we ask that the Subcommittee thoughtfully consider the issues we have raised with regard to the NAD’s application as a national dataset and supporting the state and local data providers without which it would not exist.”*

# Discussion

---

- Outstanding Attributes
  - Subaddress
  - CLDXF v1 and v2 Subaddress Type
  - Address Class
  - UUID
  - Other Items
- Other Discussion
- Next Steps

---

# Action Items

# Thank You



**Contacts:** **Matt Zimolzak**  
[matthew.a.Zimolzak@census.gov](mailto:matthew.a.Zimolzak@census.gov)  
301-763-9419

**Steve Lewis**  
[steve.lewis@dot.gov](mailto:steve.lewis@dot.gov)  
202-366-9223